

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. Claims 1-10 are pending in the application.

With regard to the objection of claim 2 due to the use of the language “one of the output buffer”, upon reading the entire claim, Applicant submits that the claim language “selecting one of the output buffer, the first output, or the second output...” is proper since it is the intended way to recite alternative language. See Superguide Corp. v. DirectTV Enterprises, Inc. 358 F.3d 870, (Fed. Cir. 2004). For example, the claim is merely reciting selecting one of A, B or C and cannot be construed that there is more than one of A. Therefore, the objection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 3-6 and 8-10 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,988,161B2 to McConnell et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a multiplexer circuit configured for switching frame data of a prescribed maximum link width to the selected active link width. Claim 6 has similar features.

The Examiner admits that McConnell fails to describe the circuit at the port of FIG. 6 to be a multiplexer circuit but contends that it would have been obvious to “understand that the circuit portrayed by McConnell is a multiplexer circuit” since the “definition of a multiplexing circuit is a circuit for selecting from many I/O going to/from a serial I/O, especially for transmission.”

As noted in Applicant’s previous response, the port in Fig. 6 of McConnell does not combine/multiplex virtual lanes, it is the InfiniBand™ protocol that does. As described at page 5, lines 13-16 of the specification, multiplexing virtual lanes on a single port is well known in the InfiniBand™ architecture. This is not what is being claimed. For example, claim 1 recites setting a multiplexer circuit to the selected link width.

Each of the independent claims specifies the multiplexer circuit configured for “selectively switching frame data of a prescribed maximum link width”. As described in the specification, the “switching” in the multiplexer of Figure 3 includes not only transfer of data,

but transfer of the data according to the appropriate width. This is simply not disclosed or suggested in McConnell et al. There is no concept of prescribed maximum link width in the virtual lane disclosure of McConnell.

In response to this argument, the Examiner stated that Applicant argued, “there is no concept of maximum lane width in the virtual lane” which is different from the claim language. Upon careful reading of Applicant’s previous arguments, it is clear that this is not what Applicant stated. Applicant stated that there is no maximum link (not lane) width in the virtual lane disclosure of McConnell, which is consistent with what is claimed. In any event, Applicant’s point is that since there is no multiplexer circuit in McConnell, there is no multiplexer circuit configured for “selectively *switching frame data of a prescribed maximum link width*.

Furthermore, the Examiner contends that the “Active Link Width (“LinkWidthActive” as disclosed in McConnell) is selected to either 1x, 4x, or 12x and that data packets 310 are transmitted from the multiplexing means of Fig. 6 according to the set Active Link Width. However, the only mention of LinkWidthActive in McConnell is at column 10, lines 36-37 where McConnell discloses, “LinkWidthActive field is used to report the number of active lanes for the Port” (emphasis added). Reporting the number of active lanes is not a disclosure of setting a multiplexer circuit, configured for selectively switching frame data of a prescribed maximum link width to a selected one of a plurality of available link widths, to the selected active link width; receiving the frame data from an output buffer according to the prescribed maximum link width; and outputting the frame data from the multiplexer circuit to a transmit bus according to the selected active link width.

For these reasons, the §103 rejection should be withdrawn because the rejection fails to establish that the applied reference teaches the claimed features. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1 and 6, and the claims that depend there-from, should be withdrawn

Claims 2 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McConnell in view of Bunton. This rejection is respectfully traversed.